1 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

SCOT RANDOLPH BARTLETT,

Plaintiff,

vs.

W. BURCHINAL, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:05-CV-00449-KJD (GWF)

ORDER, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (#23), filed on June 1, 2006 and Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (#17), filed on June 9, 2006.

BACKGROUND

This is a civil rights action in which the Plaintiff alleges that he was subjected to discipline by the Defendant jail authorities without due process of law while Plaintiff was incarcerated as a pre-trial detainee in the Clark County Detention Center. In particular, Plaintiff alleges that his "free time" privileges were taken away when one of the Defendant officers confronted him and another inmate and demanded to know which of them had a bar of soap connected to a string, commonly known in the jail as a "cadillac." Possession of such an item is allegedly prohibited under jail rules. Because neither inmate acknowledged possession of the "cadillac," the officer revoked both Plaintiff's and the other inmate's "free time" privileges. Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (#23) requests summary judgment on the issue of liability on the grounds that he was

denied due process of law. In its Oppostion (#17), the Defendants state that Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment is premature because no discovery scheduling order has been entered in this action. Unfortunately, this appears to be the case. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the following scheduling order is hereby entered in this case.

- 1. Any and all pleadings that may be brought under Fed. R. Civ. P. 13 & 14, or joining additional parties under Fed. R. Civ. P. 19 & 20, shall be filed within **sixty (60) days** from the date of this Order. Any party causing additional parties to be joined or brought into this action shall contemporaneously therewith cause a copy of this Order to be served upon the new party or parties.
- 2. Any discovery motions shall be filed and served no later than **eighty (80) days** from the date of this Order.
- 3. Motions for summary judgment shall comply with the requirements of LR 56-1 and shall be filed and served no later than **thirty (30) days after the close of discovery.**
- 4. Any motion filed beyond the time limit fixed by this Scheduling Order shall be stricken, unless the Court grants an exception for good cause shown.
- 5. **DISCOVERY:** Pursuant to LR 16-1(b), discovery in this action shall be completed on or before **ninety (90) days** from the date of this Order.
- 6. **EXTENSIONS OF DISCOVERY:** Pursuant to LR 26-4, an extension of the discovery deadline will not be allowed without a showing of good cause. All motions or stipulations to extend discovery shall be received by the Court at least **twenty (20) days** prior to the date fixed for completion of discovery by this Scheduling Order, or at least **twenty (20) days** prior to this expiration of any extension thereof that may have been approved by the Court. The motion or stipulation shall include:
- (a) A statement specifying the discovery completed by the parties of the date of the motion or stipulation;
 - (b) A specific description of the discovery which remains to be completed;
- (c) The reasons why such remaining discovery was not completed within the time limit of the existing discovery deadline; and

- (d) A proposed schedule for the completion of all remaining discovery.
- 7. In the event that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide for any shorter time periods for the filing of motions or pleadings, said shorter time limits shall apply notwithstanding the time limits set forth in this Scheduling Order. Pursuant to the authority given to the Court in Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b), motions for summary judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 must be filed no later than the time provided in paragraph 4 of this Order.
- 8. **PRETRIAL:** Pursuant to LR 16-3(a), the Clerk shall issue a Pretrial Notice Order five (5) days past the date for filing motions for summary judgment or all motions for summary judgment are denied, whichever is later.
- 9. Any party who desires an amendment to this Scheduling Order shall, within **sixty** (60) days hereof, file and serve a statement of proposed amendments and the reasons therefor. Each other party shall have **fifteen** (15) days within which to file and serve a response thereto. After expiration of the 60-day period, any amendment of this Scheduling Order shall be granted only upon motion and good cause shown.
- 10. In all cases where a party or counsel is required to effect service hereunder, a certificate of such service shall be filed forthwith with the Clerk of the Court.

RECOMMENDATION

IT IS RECOMMENDED that Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (#23) be **denied**, without prejudice to Plaintiff's right to renew it upon completion of the discovery period in this case.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2, any objection to this Finding and Recommendation must be in writing and filed with the Clerk of the Court within ten (10) days. The Supreme Court has held that the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified time. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S 140, 142 (1985). This circuit has also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal

Case 2:05-cv-00449-KJD-GWF Document 24 Filed 03/06/07 Page 4 of 4

factual issues from the order of the District Court. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). DATED this 6th day of March, 2007.